

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 6 have been rewritten as claims 8 and 10, respectively, in an effort to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. In an effort to clarify the claimed subject matter, claim 4 has been rewritten as claim 9, and other claims have been formally amended in an effort to conform them to the language of present independent claims 8 and 10.

Seam 4 formed by the aluminum-based filler provides a welding joint with aluminum material sheet 2 and a soldering joint with iron or titanium material sheet 1. The claim language now also makes clear that one of the sheets is of aluminum material while the other sheet is of iron or titanium material. It is respectfully submitted that reformulated claims 8 and 10 comply with Sec. 112.

The rejection of claims 1 and 6 (now 8 and 10) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bertels, cited, is respectfully traversed. This patent has been acknowledged as prior art in applicants' specification, and it is respectfully submitted that it neither anticipates the claimed subject matter, nor makes it obvious. Bertels does **not** suggest the soldering joint having a width **b** extending along the iron or titanium sheet which corresponds to at least three times the

thickness **d** of the iron or titanium sheet, as clearly shown in Fig. 2. Seam 17 of Bertels would not be strong enough without apertures 20 filled with the filler forming the seam (col. 2, lines 37-49, of the patent). Applicants provide a strong soldering joint by making it very wide along the iron or titanium sheet, i.e. three times as wide as the thickness of this sheet, as clearly shown in Fig. 2. As Figs. 5a,b,c of Bertels illustrate, this is not suggested by the patent teaching. Accordingly, claims 8 and 10 are believed clearly to be patentable over Bertels, and the claims dependent thereon are believed to be allowable therewith.


For the same reasons, the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Masahiro et al, cited, is respectfully traversed. As the drawing clearly shows, Masahiro et al's weld zone 5 has a width which is a small fraction of the thickness of the joined sheets.

Applicants enclose a petition for a one-month extension for filing a response.

A sincere effort having been made to overcome all grounds of rejection, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, and 7-10 are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIAN SCHMARANZER ET AL




Kurt Kelman, Reg. No. 18,628
Allison C. Collard, Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29,298
Attorneys for Applicants

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Encls.: Request for extension of time

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP Amendment, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on September 20, 2006.


Kelly Espitia

R:\USERS\imittendorf\KELMAN\SCHMARANZER ET AL-1 PCT - AMEND SEPT. 06.wpd